



Appl. No. 10/647,814

Examiner: Solak, Timothy, Art Unit 3746

In response to the Office Action dated August 24, 2005

Date: November 24, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. 10111953

To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach every element of the claim. In this regard, the Federal Circuit has held:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

"The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 1 and 2 are independent. Claim 1 recites an inflatable product including an inflatable body; a socket built in the inflatable body; an electric pump, including a pump body and an air outlet, connected to the socket to pump the inflatable body, wherein the pump body is wholly or partially located in the socket; and a connector provided at a predetermined position of the electric pump for connecting an external power to actuate the electric pump.

Claim 2 recites an inflatable product including an inflatable body; a socket built in the inflatable body; and an electric pump, including a pump body and an air outlet, connected to the socket to pump the inflatable body, wherein the pump body is wholly or partially located in the socket.

Applicant notes that both claims 1 and 2 recite, *inter alia*, an **inflatable product** including an **inflatable body**, a socket **built in the inflatable body**, and an electric pump, including a pump body and an air outlet, wherein the pump body is wholly or partially located in the socket.

Wortman et al teach a mattress for relieving pressure ulcers. Wortman et al's mattress is described as follows:

The mattress 30 includes a foam bottom support member 32 which may have a thickness of, for example, perhaps about 1 inch. Member 32 supports along its perimeter a crib 34 which in turn supports another crib 36. The cribs 34 and 36 and support 32 are adhesively or otherwise suitably attached ... Cribs 34 and 36 are also composed of a

foam material. [See column 6, lines 4-10]

The cribs 34 and 36 define a framework in which are received lower and upper air cells 44 and 46 respectively to rest on support member 32. [See column 6, lines 24-26]

In order to allow the pump 59 to be contained within the boundaries of the mattress so that it may unobtrusively be "within" the mattress, the pump 59 is mounted within a notch, illustrated at 63, *formed by a cut-out in a lower corner of the foot portion of the crib support structure*. The notch 63 is suitably sized to the dimensions of the pump 59. [See column 12, lines 61-66, emphasis added]

In the rejections over Wortman et al, the office action relies on mattress 30 to teach an inflatable body and notch 63 to teach the socket of claims 1 and 2.

Applicant submits that the only inflatable bodies disclosed in Wortman et al are the air cells/cushions (for example, air cells 44 and 46). Mattress 30 cannot be characterized as the "inflatable body" of the claims because it comprises a foam bottom support 32, foam crib structures 34 and 36, and air cells 44 and 46, of which only air cells 44 and 46 are inflatable. In this regard, Applicant points out that claims 1 and 2 recite an inflatable product *including* an inflatable body. Thus, the inflatable product and inflatable body of the claims are not coextensive.

Applicant further notes that claims 1 and 2 recite that the socket is built in the *inflatable body*. To the contrary, notch 63 in Wortman et al is a void formed by a cut-out in a lower corner of the foot portion of the foam crib support structure. The crib support structure is not an "inflatable body" as recited in the claims.

As Wortman et al fail to teach or suggest an inflatable product including an inflatable body, a socket built in the inflatable body, and an electric pump, including a pump body and an air outlet, connected to the socket to pump the inflatable body, wherein the pump body is wholly or partially located in the socket, as recited in claims 1 and 2, it is Applicant's belief that these claims patentably distinguish over the reference. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-2 over Wortman et al be withdrawn and the claims passed to issue.

Rejections over Higgs

Claims 1-2, 5 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Higgs.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the reasons as follow.

Higgs teaches a low air loss, pressure relieving mattress system. The mattress 3 includes a flat sheet of foam material having a hollow compartment 22 formed therein and an adjacently disposed inflatable air chamber 28. A blower housing 24 containing a blower 50 is received in compartment 22. See column 2, lines 46-51 and Fig. 3 of Higgs.

In the rejections over Higgs, the office action relies on mattress 3 to teach an inflatable body and hollow compartment 22 to teach the socket of claims 1 and 2.

As in the rejection over Wortman et al, Applicant submits that the office action mistakes the inflatable product as a whole, i.e., mattress 3, for the inflatable body that is an element of the inflatable product, i.e., inflatable air chamber 28. More specifically, with reference to Fig. 3 of Higgs, the hollow compartment 22 at the interior of the mattress 3 is a void formed in a sheet of foam material for receiving a blower housing 24. The sheet of foam material is not an "inflatable body" as recited in the claims.

As Higgs fails to teach or suggest an inflatable product including an inflatable body, a socket built in the inflatable body, and an electric pump, including a pump body and an air outlet, connected to the socket to pump the inflatable body, wherein the pump body is wholly or partially located in the socket, as recited in claims 1 and 2, it is Applicant's belief that these claims patentably distinguish over the reference. Insofar as claim 7 depends from claim 1 and claims 5-6 and 8 depend from claim 2, and therefore incorporate all of the limitations of either claim 1 or 2, it is Applicant's belief that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Rejections over Higgs in view of Infante

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higgs in view of Infante. As noted above, it is Applicant's belief that claims claim 6 is allowable by virtue of its dependency from claim 2. For this reason, the Examiner's arguments in connection with this claim are considered moot and will not be addressed here.

Appl. No. 10/647,814  
Examiner: Solak, Timothy, Art Unit 3746  
In response to the Office Action dated August 24, 2005

Date: November 24, 2005  
Attorney Docket No. 10111953

Conclusion

For the reasons described above, the Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests so.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Nelson A. Quintero  
Reg. No. 52,143  
Customer No. 34,283  
Telephone: (310) 401-6180